

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-6, 12-15, 22-30 and 34-36 were rejected, claims 7-11, 16-21, and 31-33 were objected to and claims 1-21 and 25 were objected to because of certain informalities. Claims 7-11, 16, 17 and 31-33 were indicated as reciting allowable subject matter. Claims 18-21 were allowed. The drawings were objected to due to certain informalities. The specification was objected to because of certain informalities.

By the present response, claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, 18, 22, 25 and 29 have been amended, claims 7-11, 16, 17, 30 and 31 have been canceled and claims 37-43 have been added. The drawings have been amended to overcome the informality mentioned in the Office Action. The specification has been amended to overcome the informality mentioned in the Office Action.

Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-6, 12-15, 18-29 and 32-43 will remain pending in the present patent application. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to because of certain informalities in reference characters. One sheet of the drawings has been replaced to obviate the objections raised in the Office Action. Review and acceptance of the replacement drawing are requested.

Objection to the Specification

Applicants have noted the examiner's objection to the specification because of certain informalities in paragraph [0020], paragraph [0027], paragraph [0040], and paragraph [0041]. In the published version and the filed version of the application, the informalities occur in paragraph [0021], paragraph [0028], paragraph [0041], and paragraph [0042] respectively. The amendments made by the present Response,

however, follow the Examiner's numbering. No new matter has been added. Regarding the second point raised by the Examiner (concerning "first" as used in paragraph [0027]), the relevant passage appeared to be correct, and has not been amended. The replacement paragraphs are believed to obviate all of the objections raised by the Examiner. Review and acceptance of the replacement paragraphs are requested.

Claim objections due to informalities

In the Office Action, claims 1-21 and 25 were objected to because of certain informalities. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, 18 and 25 have been amended to obviate the objections raised in the Office Action. In particular, the term "adapted" has been replaced by the term "operable" in claims 1, 5, 12 and 18, the term "adapted" has been deleted in claims 3 and 14, and the term "adapted" has been replaced by the term "configured" in claims 6 and 15. Claim 25 has been amended to correct its dependency. No new matter has been added. Thus reconsideration and allowance of amended claims are requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 and claims depending therefrom:

Independent claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,236,708B1), while claims 7-11 were indicated as reciting allowable subject matter. By the present response, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features recited in claim 7. Therefore, claim 1 is in condition for allowance, as are the claims depending therefrom. Claims 7-11 have been cancelled.

Claim 12 and claims depending therefrom:

Independent claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,236,708B1), while claims 16 and 17 were indicated as reciting allowable subject matter. By the present response, claim 12 has been amended to incorporate the features recited in claim 16. Therefore, claim 12 is

in condition for allowance, as are the claims depending therefrom. Claims 16 and 17 have been cancelled.

Claim 22 and claims depending therefrom:

Independent claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,236,708B1) and under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Niklason et al. (U.S. Patent 5,872,828). Claim 31 was indicated as reciting allowable subject matter. By the present response, claim 22 has been amended to incorporate the features similar to those previously recited in claim 31. Therefore, claim 22 is in condition for allowance, as are the claims depending therefrom.

Claim 29 and claims depending therefrom:

Independent claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,236,708B1), while claims 31-33 were indicated as reciting allowable subject matter. By the present response, claim 29 has been amended to incorporate the features recited in claim 31. Therefore, claim 29 is in condition for allowance, as are the claims depending therefrom. Claims 30 and 31 have been cancelled.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,236,708B1) in view of Ivan et al. (U.S. Patent 5,877,501). Claims 6 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,236,708B1). Claims 34-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,236,708B1).

The claims rejected under this section all depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 12, and 29 discussed above. Consequently, all of the dependent claims are believed to be patentable both by virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim, as well as for the subject matter they separately recite. Reconsideration and allowance of all of the dependent claims on this basis are requested.

New claims

Seven new claims have been added by this response.

Claim 37 incorporates features originally recited in claims 1 and 8, claim 8 having been indicated as reciting allowable subject matter.

Claim 38 incorporates features originally recited in claim 9, claim 9 having been indicated as reciting allowable subject matter.

Claim 39 incorporates features originally recited in claims 1 and 10, claim 10 having been indicated as reciting allowable subject matter.

Claim 40 incorporates features originally recited in claims 11, claim 11 having been indicated as reciting allowable subject matter.

Claim 41 incorporates features originally recited in claims 12 and 17, claim 17 having been indicated as reciting allowable subject matter.

Claim 42 incorporates features originally recited in claims 29 and 32, claim 32 having been indicated as reciting allowable subject matter.

Claim 43 incorporates features originally recited in claims 29 and 33, claim 33 having been indicated as reciting allowable subject matter.

Claims 37-43 are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance.

Double patenting

Applicants have noted the double patenting rejection formulated by the examiner. However, by the amendments made with the present response, the double patenting rejection is believed to obviated.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/27/2004

Pg
Patrick S. Yoder
Reg. No. 37,479
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the sheet of drawings including Figure 2 as originally filed with the Replacement Sheet attached with the present Response.